



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,314	10/27/2003	Edgar Hoppe	070255.0630	3551
31625	7590	03/04/2009	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.			NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A	
PATENT DEPARTMENT				
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500			ART UNIT	
AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039			PAPER NUMBER	
			2421	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/04/2009	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/694,314	HOPPE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2008.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment/Request for Reconsideration filed November 20, 2008.
2. Claims 1-33 remain pending. Claims 1, 16, 17 and 19 are independent claims.

Response to Amendments

3. The objection to the Specification is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments to the title to make it more descriptive.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments in the Remarks filed on April 4, 2008 have been fully considered but are not persuasive. The following is an examiner's response to Applicants' arguments.

Applicants' arguments

All independent claims include the limitation: "digitizing the sent information transmissions and then transmitting the digitized information transmissions via satellite as IP multicast packets"

Thus, according to this limitation before transmission via a satellite the information is digitized and converted into IP multicast packets. The Examiner stated that Billmaier discloses this limitation. To this end, the citations used by the Examiner with respect to Billmaier refer to specific paragraphs such as paragraphs [0053-0057]. However, Billmaier does not use paragraph numbering. Even if the paragraphs are counted, the specific cited paragraphs 53-57 do not disclose anything about satellite transmission of IP multicast packets. Billmaier neither discloses nor suggests this limitation. According to Billmaier a media center extension unit receives merely standard television transmissions via network 103. Fig. 6 of Billmaier explains how the media center extension unit converts these standard television transmissions. According to Billmaier these television transmissions are merely converted into an MPEG stream 604. Billmaier, col. 6, line 59-67. Billmaier neither discloses nor suggests to convert the information into IP multicast packets and transmit it via satellite. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to use column and line references with respect to Billmaier to be able to follow the Examiner's arguments.

Examiner's response

The examiner respectfully notes that at p. 4, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs, the Office action indicates that while Newnam-Billmaier neither teaches nor suggests the above-mentioned limitation, Buschbaum does disclose that unidirectional IP multicast is well

Art Unit: 2421

known in the art to transmit prescribed data from a server to various different locations over the footprint (area of potential broadcast coverage) of satellites in a satellite network (Buschbaum; 1:49-59).

It is also well known in the art that a packet is “[a] collection of bits, including the address, data and control, that are switched and transmitted together. The terms frame and packet are often used synonymously.”

www.nettedautomation.com/glossary_menu/glossary_p.html.

The claimed “digitized information transmission” would be the data part of the packet and is in the form of digitized information transmission (e.g., collection of bits).

Thus, Buschbaum is considered to teach or at least suggest the claim requirement.

Applicants' arguments

Moreover, all independent claims include the limitation "installing software on a data processing equipment, like PCs or workplace computers, in which the software, after the data processing device has been connected to the data and/or communications network, permits" receiving of the information transmissions and use of at least part of the functions furnished by the information transmission"

The Examiner stated that Buchsbaum allegedly discloses this limitation. Applicant thoroughly studied Buchsbaum but could neither find any explicit or implicit disclosure of any type of software installation after a data processing device has been connected to a network. In particular, the entire disclosure of Buchsbaum does not even use the term "installing." Again, the citations used by the Examiner with respect to Buchsbaum refer to specific paragraphs. However, Buchsbaum does not use paragraph numbering. Even if the paragraphs are counted, the specific cited paragraphs 41 and 32 do not disclose anything about software that is installed after a processing device is connected to a network. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to use col. And line references with respect to Buchsbaum.

At least for these reasons, the prior art cited by the Examiner does not disclose the claimed limitations. The Examiner failed to explain how the cited prior art can be interpreted to meet the claimed limitations. Hence, Applicant believes that the present independent claims are not rendered obvious by the cited prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent Claims are allowable at least to the extent of the independent Claim to which they refer, respectively. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the dependent Claims. Applicants reserve the right to make further arguments regarding the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), if necessary, and do not concede that the Examiner's proposed combinations are proper.

Examiner's response

Contrary to Applicants' assertion, the examiner respectfully notes that Newnam-Billmaier, particularly, Newnam discloses the above-mentioned limitation at paragraphs

[0032] and [0041]. In paragraph [0032], Newnam indicates that based on the type of client device, a device-specific configuration file (e.g., the device driver software module) can be provided to (e.g., installed in) the client device that supports the interpretation of messages sent by a server system. In paragraph [0041], Newnam discloses that a base software can be downloaded over the Internet or by flashing it to the memory of a client device. Thus, Newnam is considered to teach or at least suggest the claim requirement of *installing software on a data processing equipment, ...*

According the foregoing discussion, the rejection of the independent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newnam in view of Billmaier and further in view of Buschbaum is considered proper and thus maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5 and 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. ("Newnam") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. ("Billmaier") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,161,934 to Buchsbaum.

Claim 1

Newnam discloses at least *a method for information exchange, comprising the steps of:*

producing information transmissions in a broadcast standard (see at least [0007];

FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8);

Art Unit: 2421

sending the information transmissions live from a studio (see at least [0007]; FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8).

Newnam does not specifically disclose:

receiving the information transmission by a TV decoder and feeding them into a data and/or communications network.

However, in an analogous art, Billmaier teaches a Media Center Extension (MCX) that can be integrated within a set top box (STB) and receives broadcast information from the broadband network 103 and transmits the received processed information to a television or PC via the home network 406 (see at least FIG. 5, device 404; [0053-0057]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the system taught by Billmaier in that of Newnam because the system of Billmaier applied in Newnam would greatly improve the interactive capability of the Newnam system.

The combination Newnam-Billmaier further discloses:

installing software on a data processing equipment, like PCs or workplace computers, in which the software, after the data processing device has been connected to the data and/or communications network, permits receiving of the information transmissions and use of at least part of the functions furnished by the information transmission (see at least [0041]; [0032]);

accessing the information transmission via a portal (see at least [0029]);
and

using the functions furnished by the information transmission via communications connections between the data processing equipment and studio for an interactive information exchange (see at least [0029-0033]; [0035-0036]).

The combination Newnam-Billmaier does not specifically disclose:

digitizing the sent information transmissions and then transmitting the digitized informations via satellite as IP multicast packets.

However, in an analogous art, Buchsbaum discloses that content which includes multicast file transfer software can be transmitted in a broadcast mode from a source to multiple destinations over satellite link (see at least 1:49-59).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the satellite-based content distribution method using IP multicast technology as described in Buchsbaum with the combined system of Newnam-Billmaier, as the combination of Newnam-Billmaier-Buchsbaum would allow a production studio to insert digital information into TV programming data stream and to transmit the combined information to the receiving end via satellite.

Claim 2

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buchsbaum further discloses *wherein access to an information transmission and/or use of the functions provided by the information transmission occurs as a function of access authorization* (Newnam; see at least [0029]; accessing WebTV using dial-up communication requires authentication).

Claim 3

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buchsbaum further discloses *wherein access to an information transmission occurs after access to the portal and call-up of a link for information transmission* (Newnam; see at least [0029]).

Claim 4

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 2 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buchsbaum does not specifically disclose *wherein access authorizations are sent by email and/or an SMS method to a selected group of persons*. However, this feature is deemed inherent to Newnam's chat facilities (see at least FIG. 9) which

Art Unit: 2421

require an apparent authorization process because in order to join a chatroom a user has to give his/her e-mail address. See also definition below:

Chat “is a bit like e-mail in real time. Users have conversations via the keyboard in "Chat rooms" with other users. Chat has been criticized for being addictive as well as concerns over unsuitable contact between children and adults. To join a chatroom you usually have to give your e-mail address and this can lead to spam.

www.smallbizonline.co.uk/glossary_of_internet_terms.php”

Thus, without sending request for participation and authorization by the other party, chat session cannot be conducted.

Claim 5

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the TV decoder, which feeds the received data into a local network, like a local area network (LAN) and/or an audio feedback channel from a data processing unit, like a PC or workplace computer, is coupled to the production studio of the information transmission via a virtual private network (VPN) separate from a satellite transmission channel* (Billmaier; see at least FIG. 5).

Claim 7

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein playback of the information transmission on the data processing equipment, like PCs or workplace computers, occurs with one or more Web browsers* (Newnam; see at least [0041]).

Claim 8

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein, for playback of information transmissions in a Web browser, several windows, like a window for live presentation of a moderator or teacher in the*

Art Unit: 2421

studio (film window) or a window for presentation of graphics and/or tests (graphics window), are provided (Newnam; see at least [0041]; FIG. 9; claim 12; [0037]).

Claim 9

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 8 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the windows provided for playback of information transmissions in a Web browser are sent in full screen representation* (Newnam; see at least FIG. 9).

Claim 10

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the software, after log-on at a portal, is installed by an initial applet on the data processing equipment or software installed on the data processing equipment is updated after log-on at the portal* (Newnam; see at least [0032]; [0041]).

Claim 11

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the functions provided by the information transmission include execution and/or evaluation of surveys, execution and/or evaluation of multiple choice tests (MCT), layout, connection and/or management of telephone connections, data transmission, especially text transmission, between the data processing equipment and production studio and/or management* (Newnam; see at least [0034-0036]; [0050]).

Claim 12

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 11 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum does not specifically disclose *wherein surveys and/or tests are designed as HTML-programmed files*. However, this feature is deemed inherent

Art Unit: 2421

in the Newnam's questions and answers or real-time polls and trivia to be displayed on the end-user's screen. Without using the HTML, the end-user's screen does not know how to display the questions and answers or trivias. Furthermore if there are questions and answers that require linking to another location of the same document or to another document, HTML or derivatives of HTML must be used. Moreover, Newnam, in [0041], discloses that the base software can be incorporated in other software, such as in browser, one of the definitions of which is shown below:

[a] browser, or web browser, is the software used to view web pages and interact with various kinds of Internet resources. The browser interprets the HTML used to format web documents and recreates the page on your screen. There are a variety of web browsers available, the two most common being Microsoft's Internet Explorer and Netscape's Navigator.

www.liv.ac.uk/webteam/glossary/

Claim 13

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 11 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein a time limitation is stipulated for processing of surveys and/or tests and after this time elapses, the survey and/or test files are automatically closed for processing* (Newnam; see at least [0048]).

Claim 14

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein data and/or files, like text files, sent to the production studio and/or management are conveyed as email and/or as SMS messages to one or more designatable receivers* (Newnam; see at least [0035-0036]).

Claim 15

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the method is carried out in a computer program which*

Art Unit: 2421

can be downloaded from an electronic data network, like the Internet, to a data processing unit connected to the data network (Newnam; see at least [0041]).

Claim 16

Since Claim 16 is an independent claim that recites *an arrangement with at least one processor and/or chip setup so that a method for information exchange can be carried out, comprising the same steps of the method recited in Claim 1*, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 17

Since Claim 17 is an independent claim that recites *a computer program product stored on a computer readable storage medium for, when run on a computer, carrying out a method for information exchange, comprising the same steps of the method recited in Claim 1*, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 18

The rejection of base claim 17 is incorporated. Since Claim 18 recites the same features of Claim 15, the same rejection is thus applied.

7. Claims 19-23 and 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. (“Newnam”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. (“Billmaier”).

Claim 19

Newnam discloses at least *a method for information exchange, comprising the steps of:*
producing information transmissions in a broadcast standard wherein the information transmissions include TV information and digital information (see at least [0007]; FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8);

sending the information transmissions live from a studio (see at least [0007]; FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8).

Newnam does not specifically disclose:

receiving the information transmission by a TV decoder and feeding them into a data and/or communications network;

feeding the extracted video and digital information into a data processing equipment and connecting the data processing equipment to a data and/or communication network and accessing a main data processing equipment associated with the studio through the data and/or communication network.

However, in an analogous art, Billmaier teaches a Media Center Extension (MCX) that can be integrated within a set top box (STB) and receives broadcast information from the broadband network 103 and transmits the received processed information to a television or PC via the home network 406 (see at least FIG. 5, device 404; [0053-0057]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the system taught by Billmaier in that of Newnam because the system of Billmaier applied in Newnam would greatly improve the interactive capability of the Newnam system.

The combination Newnam-Billmaier further discloses:

extracting video information and digital information from the information transmissions (see at least FIG. 9, e.g., the video is extracted to be displayed in 410 and the digital is extracted to be displayed in 720 or 730 or 710);

decoding functions from the extracted digital information (see at least FIG. 9 and [0054]; in the case of the STB 110, the claimed “decoding functions” is interpreted as the adjustment of the placement of the interactive components based on the different type of the client device by the content display interface); and

using the functions furnished by the digital information via the established communications connection between the data processing equipment and the studio for an interactive information exchange (see at least [0029-0033]; [0035-0036]).

Claim 20

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 20 recites the same feature of Claim 2, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 21

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 21 recites the same feature of Claim 3, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 22

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 20 are incorporated. Since Claim 22 recites the same feature of Claim 4, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 23

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 23 recites the same feature of Claim 5, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 25

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 25 recites the same feature of Claim 7, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 26

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 26 recites the same feature of Claim 8, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 27

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 26 are incorporated. Since Claim 27 recites the same feature of Claim 9, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 28

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 28 recites the same feature of Claim 10, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 29

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 29 recites the same feature of Claim 11, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 30

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 29 are incorporated. Since Claim 30 recites the same feature of Claim 12, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 31

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 29 are incorporated. Since Claim 31 recites the same feature of Claim 13, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 32

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 32 recites the same feature of Claim 14, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 33

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 33 recites the same feature of Claim 15, the same rejection is thus applied.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. ("Newnam") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. ("Billmaier") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,161,934 to Buchsbaum..

Claim 6

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Newnam does not specifically disclose *wherein speech communication occurs as voiceover IP (VoIP) via an audio feedback channel*. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that

“**[v]oice over Internet Protocol**, also called **VoIP, IP Telephony, Internet telephony, Broadband telephony, Broadband Phone** and **Voice over Broadband**” which “is the routing of voice conversations over the Internet or through any other IP-based network” is old and well established in the art and that

“**[c]ompanies providing VoIP service are commonly referred to as providers, and protocols which are used to carry voice signals over the IP network are commonly referred to as Voice over IP or VoIP protocols**. They may be viewed as commercial realizations of the experimental Network Voice Protocol (1973) invented for the ARPANET providers” for the following purposes:

“**[V]oIP is location independent, only an internet connection is needed to get a connection to a VoIP provider; for instance call center agents using VoIP phones can work from anywhere with a sufficiently fast and stable Internet connection.**

VoIP phones can integrate with other services available over the Internet, including video conversation, message or data file exchange in parallel with the conversation, audio conferencing, managing address books and passing information about whether others (e.g. friends or colleagues) are available online to interested parties.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included VoIP in Newnam because the skilled artisan would have recognized that the advantages of integrating VoIP with other services using IP protocol in Newnam would enhance the information exchange taught in Newnam.

9. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. (“Newnam”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. (“Billmaier”).

Claim 24

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 24 recites the same feature of Claim 6, the same rejection is thus applied.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu “Antony” Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, John Miller can be reached at (571) 272-7353.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2400 Group receptionist (571) 272-2400.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

Art Unit: 2421

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoang-Vu Antony Nguyen-Ba/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421

March 1, 2009

Application/Control Number: 10/694,314
Art Unit: 2421

Page 17